

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION**

Gary Rowland Knight,	)	
,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 8:22-cv-04511-TMC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	<b>ORDER</b>
Rick Clark, Sheriff; and Drew Cisco,	)	
LT,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.		

Gary Rowland Knight (“Knight”), a pretrial detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, brought this action against Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), (e) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. Now before the court is the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that the court dismiss this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915 and § 1915A without further leave to amend and without issuance and service of process. (ECF No. 22). The Report was mailed to Plaintiff at the address he provided the court, (ECF No. 23), and has not been returned as undeliverable. Therefore, Plaintiff is presumed to have received the Report. Plaintiff was advised of his right to file specific objections to the Report. (ECF No. 22 at 11). However, Plaintiff has filed no objections or responses of any kind, and the time to do so has now run. Accordingly, this matter is ripe for review.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Wimmer v. Cook*, 774 F.2d 68, 72 (4th Cir. 1985)

(quoting *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976)). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *Greenspan v. Brothers Prop. Corp.*, 103 F. Supp. 3d 734, 737 (D.S.C. 2015) (citing *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199–200 (4th Cir. 1983)). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 Advisory Committee’s note).

Having reviewed the Report and finding no clear error, the court agrees with, and wholly adopts, the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in the Report (ECF No. 22), which is incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s action is **DISMISSED without further leave to amend and without issuance and service of process.**<sup>1</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Timothy M. Cain  
United States District Judge

Anderson, South Carolina  
April 27, 2023

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

---

<sup>1</sup> The court would reach the same result under a *de novo* standard of review.